

# **Analyses of GARVEE Bonding Capacity 2003**

Analyses for the  
California Transportation Commission  
April 2003

State Treasurer Philip Angelides



# Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary	i
Purpose of Analyses	1
Uncertainty Drives Need for Sensitivity Analyses	2
Information Sources	2
Summary of Alternative Assumptions	3
Summary of Results	5
Market Update	8
Recent Events	9
Conclusion	10

## **Attachments**

A: Monthly Deposits to State Highway Account from Federal Funds

B: Detailed Assumptions for Sensitivity Analyses

C: Detailed Worksheets for Sensitivity Analyses

D: Detailed Charts for Sensitivity Analyses

## Executive Summary

---

These analyses are provided to the California Transportation Commission to assist its compliance with the provisions of SB 928 (Burton) (Chapter 862 of 1999) requiring the Commission to prepare, in conjunction with the Treasurer's office, an annual analysis of California's bonding capacity for issuing Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles, or GARVEE notes, which are capital market borrowings repaid by federal transportation funds deposited in the State Highway Account.

The State's authority for issuance of GARVEE notes derives both from federal legislation and from the passage of SB 928 in 1999. The bill was sponsored by the State Treasurer's Office to ensure California had the necessary state legislative authority to make use of this new financing tool for accelerating high priority transportation projects. The bill became effective January 1, 2000. This bonding capacity analysis is the fourth prepared since 2000.

The issuance of GARVEE notes is subject to one important condition: the Treasurer may not authorize the issuance of the notes if the annual debt service on all outstanding GARVEE notes would exceed 30 percent of the State's historical annual deposits in the State Highway Account from federal funding.

Thus, the current and any future bonding capacity analyses must take place in the context of this "cap." These historical annual deposits are a known quantity at any given point in time, but clearly are subject to change over time, and must be re-examined at the time of each potential GARVEE note issuance.

Additional factors affecting bonding capacity, such as maturity structures and interest rates, also are subject to uncertainty at this time. As a result, these analyses continue the practice of prior analyses by providing numerous "sensitivity analyses" under a range of scenarios, with varying assumptions for maturity dates, interest rates, and available revenues. This approach should continue to assist the Commission in examining and responding to future applications in the context of alternative scenarios.

Our analyses include scenarios with five-year maturity GARVEE notes issued in 2004 and maturing in 2009. The analyses show a resulting bonding capacity ranging from a low of \$3.06 billion to a high of \$3.73 billion under varying market conditions, assuming all federal deposits to the State Highway Account are used in the capacity calculations. These capacity amounts differ from the amounts reported last year and continue to reflect increases. In 2002, the comparable bonding capacity ranged from a low of \$2.09 billion to a high of \$3.04 billion.

If one excludes the portion of these federal deposits characterized as “pass-through” revenues to local agencies, the bonding capacity is reduced, ranging from a low of \$2.27 billion to a high of \$2.76 billion given the same range of market conditions and a five-year maturity. In 2002, the comparable bonding capacity ranged from a low of \$1.55 billion to a high of \$2.25 billion. The primary factors that contributed to the change in capacity are higher revenues and lower market interest rates.

Additional scenarios of GARVEE bonding capacity are provided as “sensitivity analyses” under various revenue and interest rate assumptions, with final maturities at ten, fifteen, and twenty years. Details regarding the assumptions used for all the analyses are found in the body of this document and in the various attachments.

These analyses demonstrate that the capacity existing within the State’s GARVEE program can be affected dramatically by a wide range of circumstances, including policy and market factors. Therefore, the analyses should be used, not as a prescription, but rather as a tool for understanding the implications of alternative applications and the related potential GARVEE note structures that the Commission may be asked to consider over the coming year.

## Purpose of Analyses

---

The following analyses are provided to assist the California Transportation Commission in meeting the requirements of SB 928 (Burton) (Chapter 862), sponsored by the State Treasurer's Office to ensure California had the necessary state legislative authority to make use of this financing tool for accelerating high priority transportation projects. The analyses relate specifically to those requirements found in Section 14553(b) of the Government Code, which states:

*“Notwithstanding Section 7550.5 of the Government Code, on or before April 1 of each year, the commission, in conjunction with the Treasurer's office, shall prepare an annual analysis of the bonding capacity of federal transportation funds deposited in the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund.”*

The analyses have been performed consistent with the GARVEE notes bonding capacity guidelines provided in Section 14553.4 of the Government Code, which states:

*“The Treasurer may not authorize the issuance of notes if the annual repayment obligations of all outstanding notes in any fiscal year would exceed 30 percent of the total amount of federal transportation funds deposited in the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund for any consecutive 12-month period within the preceding 24 months.”*

The following analyses are intended to measure the capacity of the State Highway Account to support future issuance of GARVEE notes, given both the historical record of federal deposits to the State Highway Account and the “cap” on total outstanding GARVEE notes which would result from the 30 percent limitation referenced above.

# Uncertainty Drives Need for Sensitivity Analyses

---

The dynamics of financial markets, the ultimate timing, maturity, interest costs, and level of available revenues related to any future GARVEE notes are uncertain. As a result, no single bonding capacity analysis is sufficient for purposes of guiding the Commission’s evaluation and response to future applications for GARVEE funding. Therefore, to facilitate an informed consideration of future applications with structures and terms not yet known to the Commission, we have performed a series of “sensitivity analyses” under alternative scenarios. The factors that have been varied in these different analyses are identified in the following table.

Primary Factors Affecting Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses
Final Maturity
Assumed Interest Rates
Annual Revenues Available
Treatment of Local “Pass-Through” Revenues

## Information Sources

---

In performing these bonding capacity analyses, the State Treasurer’s Office (STO) is relying on data obtained from the California Department of Transportation (the Department) regarding deposits into the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund from federal transportation funds. This information was provided on a monthly basis for the period of January 1999 through December 2002. See **Attachment A** for the complete listing of these monthly deposits and related calculations. Based on the trend of previous years, approximately 26 percent, or \$49 million average per month, of the federal deposits consist of local “pass-through” revenues, earmarked for local agency projects. Alternative treatments of these local pass-through revenues were taken into account in the analyses, as discussed in more detail below.

Estimates of potential interest costs under various scenarios were developed by the STO based on indices published by such industry-standard sources as Municipal Market Data. The interest rates used in the analyses were developed given expected trading ranges of the State’s future GARVEE notes as compared to current interest rates for “A” rated general obligation bonds of similar final maturities and average maturities. Alternative market conditions also were taken into account in the analyses, as discussed in more detail below.

## Summary of Alternative Assumptions

---

The two alternative scenarios for market conditions utilized in these analyses are as follows:

- I. Base Case:** Assumes current market conditions for A-rated bonds
- II. Market Sensitivity Case:** Assumes alternative market conditions for A-rated bonds

Within each of these alternative scenarios for market conditions, we also varied the revenue assumptions, as follows:

- 1. Low Revenue:** Assumes the lowest cumulative 12-month revenues within the last 24 months (ending in December 2002)
- 2. Average Revenue:** Assumes the average cumulative 12-month revenues within the last 24 months (ending in December 2002)
- 3. High Revenue:** Assumes the highest cumulative 12-month revenues within the last 24 months (ending in December 2002)

Within each of these alternative markets and varied revenue analyses, we also considered two different treatments of local pass-through revenues:

- A. Included:** Deposits representing local pass-through revenues are included for purposes of bonding capacity calculations
- B. Excluded:** Deposits representing local pass-through revenues are excluded for purposes of bonding capacity calculations

Finally, for each scenario we varied the maturity of the bonds, as indicated below. The table below summarizes the range of assumptions for the various factors that are adjusted to achieve each sensitivity analysis. The different scenarios for each factor combine for a total of twelve different sensitivity analyses.

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Range of Assumptions</b>
Final Maturity	Four scenarios: varying at 5, 10, 15 & 20 years from date of issuance
Assumed Interest Rates	Two scenarios: one at current market rates and one at approximately 100 basis points above current market rates, adjusted for average maturity and potential shifts in the yield curve
Annual Revenues Available	Three scenarios: one at the lowest 12-month cumulative revenues, a second at the average 12-month cumulative revenues, and a third at the highest 12-month cumulative revenues over the last 24 months, ending December 2002
Treatment of Local Pass-Through Revenues	Two scenarios: one including all local pass-through revenues within Annual Revenues for purpose of debt capacity test, and one excluding all local pass-through revenues from the debt capacity test

See **Attachment B** for the detailed assumptions utilized in each sensitivity analysis, as the factors presented previously are varied to achieve the complete set of alternative scenarios.

It also should be noted that the current analyses, by necessity, require significant simplification as compared to the myriad of structuring nuances that would be involved in actual note sales. As a result, certain ambiguities or alternative interpretations could lead to somewhat differing results in practice. One example of a simplification common to all scenarios is the assumption that all GARVEE notes within the capacity of a given scenario would be issued in a single, initial year, not staggered over multiple years as typically would be expected in a bonding program of significant magnitude.

If, instead, such bonds were staggered and the program was assumed to have a fixed “end date” represented by the assumed final maturity used in each scenario, each resulting measure of maximum bonding capacity would have to be adjusted downward. This would be necessary because the GARVEE notes issued in subsequent years would have a shorter period during which to amortize principal before the fixed end date. This would increase the annual debt service necessary for a given par amount of notes, causing a reduction in total bonding capacity, assuming a fixed amount of annual revenues for each scenario.



Alternatively, this simplification would not have this constraint on capacity if the program were assumed to be structured on a “rolling maturity” basis, that is, with each GARVEE note issued in subsequent years within each scenario having exactly the same underlying terms, such as total years to maturity and interest rate, regardless of the timing of its issuance within the life span of the program. This latter simplification also would assume a fixed amount of annual revenues for each scenario.

This discussion is offered as an example, which is by no means exhaustive, of the implications of the necessary simplifications involved in any analysis of bonding capacity given current uncertainty about the “real life” conditions that will exist at the time of any future issuance of GARVEE notes. Therefore, care should be exercised in using these analyses, to avoid erroneous interpretations or conclusions.

## **Summary of Results**

---

The current analyses resulted in a higher bonding capacity than last year’s estimates. For example, a 5-year maturity note issuance corresponds to a bonding capacity ranging from \$3.06 billion (low revenue, market sensitivity case) to \$3.73 billion (high revenue, base case). These levels represent increases of \$969 million and \$692 million, respectively, over those in 2002, or increases of 46 percent and 23 percent over last year.

The differences in longer note maturities reflect increases as well, although not as great in some scenarios. For example, a 20-year maturity note issuance under current market conditions corresponds to an estimated bonding capacity ranging from \$8.58 billion (low revenue, market sensitivity case) to \$11.07 billion (high revenue, base case). These levels represent increases of \$3.23 billion and \$2.43 billion, respectively, over 2002 levels, or increases of 40 percent and 28 percent.

Excluding the portion of these federal deposits characterized as “pass-through” revenues to local agencies, a 5-year maturity note issuance corresponds to a bonding capacity ranging from \$2.27 billion (low revenue, market sensitivity case) to \$2.76 billion (high revenue, base case), or \$72 million and \$51 million more, respectively, than in 2002.

The higher interest rates used in the market sensitivity cases reduce bonding capacity in all cases.

The change in estimated capacity is primarily due to the following factors:

1. Higher federal deposits in the State Highway Account during the 24 month analysis period (January 2001 through December 2002); and
2. lower overall market interest rates.

The average monthly deposits into the State Highway Account during the analysis period are higher than one year ago. For example, the average monthly deposit from January 2001 through December 2002 was over \$199 million, or \$38 million more than from January 2000 through December 2001. The 12-month rolling average for this year's analyses is \$2.52 billion, which is \$734 million more than last year.

The interest rates used for the 2003 analyses assume an "A" rating on the bonds. This year has seen an unprecedented decline in municipal market interest rates, reaching historical lows. As a result, the average interest rate of 2.28 percent for an "A" rated bond with a five-year maturity assumed this year is 132 basis points below the average interest rate of 3.60 percent for an "A" rated bond assumed in the 2002 analyses.

The following table summarizes key results of our analyses. Detailed worksheets supporting the results can be found in Attachment C for ease of reference.

Summary of Results for GARVEE Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses		
Scenario	I. Base Case Current Conditions	II. Market Sensitivity Case Alternative Conditions
<b>1-A: Low Revenue, Include Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$3.15 billion	\$3.06 billion
10 year maturity	\$5.75 billion	\$5.47 billion
15 year maturity	\$7.80 billion	\$7.27 billion
20 year maturity	\$9.36 billion	\$8.58 billion
<b>1-B: Low Revenue, Exclude Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$2.33 billion	\$2.27 billion
10 year maturity	\$4.26 billion	\$4.05 billion
15 year maturity	\$5.77 billion	\$5.38 billion
20 year maturity	\$6.93 billion	\$6.35 billion
<b>2-A: Avg. Revenue, Include Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$3.53 billion	\$3.43 billion
10 year maturity	\$6.45 billion	\$6.13 billion
15 year maturity	\$8.74 billion	\$8.15 billion
20 year maturity	\$10.50 billion	\$9.61 billion
<b>2-B: Avg. Revenue, Exclude Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$2.61 billion	\$2.54 billion
10 year maturity	\$4.77 billion	\$4.54 billion
15 year maturity	\$6.47 billion	\$6.03 billion
20 year maturity	\$7.76 billion	\$7.11 billion
<b>3-A: High Revenue, Include Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$3.73 billion	\$3.62 billion
10 year maturity	\$6.80 billion	\$6.47billion
15 year maturity	\$9.22 billion	\$8.60 billion
20 year maturity	\$11.07 billion	\$10.14 billion
<b>3-B: High Revenue, Exclude Local Pass-Through Revenues</b>		
5 year maturity	\$2.76 billion	\$2.68 billion
10 year maturity	\$5.03 billion	\$4.79 billion
15 year maturity	\$6.82 billion	\$6.36 billion
20 year maturity	\$8.19 billion	\$7.50 billion

## Market Update

---

For the bonding capacity analyses, we chose to continue using the “A” rating as a conservative base. However, market feedback suggests that “AA” ratings on GARVEE issues are reachable. Structuring features that may assist in moving ratings into the “AA” range and above may include:

1. Pledge of additional funding sources beyond the federal reimbursements that are not subject to appropriation, re-programming, or restriction;
2. coverage ratios starting in the 4:1 and 5:1 ranges;
3. establishment of debt service reserves; and
4. use of insurance.

Each one of the above options represents a trade-off in program flexibility and a cost benefit decision for the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as it moves towards utilizing GARVEE notes as a financing tool. For comparison purposes, it is worth noting that the use of “AA” rating notes garner only nominal increases in estimated bonding capacity under the same analysis assumptions. For the five-year scenario, the analyses show a resulting bonding capacity ranging from a low of \$3.09 (low revenue, market sensitivity case) to \$3.76 billion (high revenue, base case). These levels represent increases of \$25 million and \$31 million respectively, or increases of 0.83 percent and 0.84 percent over the same scenarios assuming “A” rating.

## Recent Events

---

Since the 2002 bonding capacity report, no additional projects have been proposed to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for GARVEE financing. The \$171 million San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) I-15 Managed Lanes Project was approved by the CTC as part of the 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the first construction contract is scheduled for award in mid-2003, with GARVEE bond proceeds anticipated in January 2004.

The financing plan for the priority SANDAG project, as well as other projects being considered for GARVEE financing, is being revised to reflect the suspension of Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) allocations, consistent with Executive Order D-64-02. The Administration's mid-year spending proposal included an additional transfer of \$100 million from the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) to the General Fund for the current fiscal year and cancels planned General Fund transfers to the TCRF in the 2003/2004 fiscal year. Those agencies utilizing TCRP allocations as a funding source for their projects are now identifying other funding sources to complete their projects. It is not anticipated that the loss of TCRP funding will delay the targeted dates for construction or financing of the I-15 Managed Lanes Project.

Statutes of 2001 (AB 438) and Statutes of 2002 (AB 3026) amended the Government Code expanding the definition of projects eligible for GARVEE financing to include those in the State Highway Operations Protection Program (SHOPP), Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program, Traffic Congestion Relief Program, as well as inclusion of Interregional Transportation Improvement Program projects in the STIP. To assist Regional Transportation Planning Agencies with the use of GARVEE financing for their projects, the California Department of Transportation (the Department) has proposed certain amendments to the existing GARVEE guidelines, which reflect the legislative changes and provide further clarification about the Program. The guidelines address project eligibility, programming of STIP or SHOPP projects, debt service programming, allocation of funds, issuance of bonds, project reimbursements and project cost changes. The Department anticipates presenting the proposed amendments to the CTC for review at the April 2003 meeting and for approval at the subsequent May meeting.

## Conclusion

---

As the above analyses show, the ultimate capacity existing within the State's GARVEE program will depend on a wide range of circumstances over time, including market conditions, maturity structures, available revenues, and other factors that may be considered by the California Transportation Commission over the coming year.

We hope these analyses will prove useful in the consideration of future applications in light of some of the structuring options available under the GARVEE program, in addition to meeting the immediate goal of assisting the Commission in preparing its annual report.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**MONTHLY DEPOSITS TO  
STATE HIGHWAY ACCOUNT  
FROM FEDERAL FUNDS**

# Cumulative 12-Month Federal Deposits into State Highway Account Over 24-month period, ending December 31, 2002

Period Covered		12-Mo. Total Revenues Deposited	
Jan-01	Dec-01	<b>\$2,247,710,416.63</b>	<b>Lowest 12-mo. Total</b>
Feb-01	Jan-02	\$2,329,699,946.01	
Mar-01	Feb-02	\$2,437,336,024.97	
Apr-01	Mar-02	\$2,581,203,480.27	
May-01	Apr-02	<b>\$2,657,880,769.39</b>	<b>Highest 12-mo. Total</b>
Jun-01	May-02	\$2,617,236,260.93	
Jul-01	Jun-02	\$2,465,932,209.90	
Aug-01	Jul-02	\$2,532,168,480.45	
Sep-01	Aug-02	\$2,543,832,549.37	
Oct-01	Sep-02	\$2,584,730,192.34	
Nov-01	Oct-02	\$2,629,343,698.56	
Dec-01	Nov-02	\$2,577,318,232.24	
Jan-02	Dec-02	\$2,545,239,025.28	\$2,247,710,416.63
		<b>\$2,519,202,406.64</b>	<b>Average 12-mo. Total</b>

Source: California Department of Transportation



# Federal Deposits into the State Highway Account

	Federal Deposits -- By Month			
	1999	2000	2001	2002
Month		Deposit Amount	Deposit Amount	Deposit Amount
January	\$ 201,606,455.01	\$ 214,693,101.00	\$ 292,768,595.59	\$ 374,758,124.97
February	\$ 70,480,828.62	\$ 94,948,610.41	\$ 101,908,226.48	\$ 209,544,305.44
March	\$ 131,057,017.42	\$ 205,220,057.43	\$ 116,551,593.66	\$ 260,419,048.96
April	\$ 122,732,697.83	\$ 147,504,794.21	\$ 119,796,825.42	\$ 196,474,114.54
May	\$ 132,322,008.15	\$ 108,381,081.51	\$ 156,000,075.99	\$ 115,355,567.53
June	\$ 121,341,118.90	\$ 167,864,562.76	\$ 253,660,527.36	\$ 102,356,476.33
July	\$ 132,756,296.49	\$ 150,382,435.48	\$ 147,895,873.85	\$ 214,132,144.40
August	\$ 249,424,523.43	\$ 117,373,486.00	\$ 204,700,825.57	\$ 216,364,894.49
September	\$ 202,260,569.27	\$ 122,198,875.54	\$ 174,876,482.17	\$ 215,774,125.14
October	\$ 122,918,370.81	\$ 150,734,015.97	\$ 182,116,657.75	\$ 226,730,163.97
November	\$ 109,248,154.57	\$ 104,873,241.58	\$ 234,233,366.71	\$ 182,207,900.39
December	\$ 140,192,794.42	\$ 41,768,650.18	\$ 263,201,366.08	\$ 231,122,159.12
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 1,736,340,834.92	\$ 1,625,942,912.07	\$ 2,247,710,416.63	\$ 2,545,239,025.28
<b>Monthly average <sup>(1)</sup></b>		\$140,095,156.12	\$161,402,222.03	\$199,706,226.75

<sup>(1)</sup> For the preceding 24 months period ending December 31 of the respective calendar year.  
Source: California Department of Transportation

**DETAILED ASSUMPTIONS  
FOR SENSITIVITY ANALYSES**

## Summary of Assumptions for GARVEE Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses

### I. Base Case – Current Market Conditions

Scenarios	Factors	Assumptions	Comments
<b>Scenario 1 (Low Rev)</b> <b>* including 1-A, 1-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	2.28%, 3.00%, 3.44% and 3.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in current market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,247,710,000	Lowest 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 1-A: Included Scenario 1-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 1-A: \$674,313,000 Scenario 1-B: \$498,992,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 1-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 1-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs
<b>Scenario 2 (Avg Rev)</b> <b>* including 2-A, 2-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	2.28%, 3.00%, 3.44% and 3.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in current market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,519,202,000	Average 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 2-A: Included Scenario 2-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 2-A: \$755,761,000 Scenario 2-B: \$559,263,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 2-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 2-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs

## Summary of Assumptions for GARVEE Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses

### I. Base Case – Current Market Conditions

Scenarios	Factors	Assumptions	Comments
<b>Scenario 3 (Hi Rev)</b> <b>* including 3-A, 3-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	2.28%, 3.00%, 3.44% and 3.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in current market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,657,881,000	Average 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 3-A: Included Scenario 3-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 3-A: \$797,364,000 Scenario 3-B: \$590,050,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 3-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 3-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs

## Summary of Assumptions for GARVEE Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses

### II. Market Sensitivity Case – Alternative Market Conditions

Scenarios	Factors	Assumptions	Comments
<b>Scenario 1 (Low Rev)</b> <b>* including 1-A, 1-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	3.28%, 4.00%, 4.44% and 4.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in alternative market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,247,710,000	Lowest 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 1-A: Included Scenario 1-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 1-A: \$674,313,000 Scenario 1-B: \$498,992,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 1-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 1-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs
<b>Scenario 2 (Avg Rev)</b> <b>* including 2-A, 2-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	3.28%, 4.00%, 4.44% and 4.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in alternative market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,519,202,000	Average 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 2-A: Included Scenario 2-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 2-A: \$755,761,000 Scenario 2-B: \$559,263,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 2-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 2-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs

## Summary of Assumptions for GARVEE Bonding Capacity Sensitivity Analyses

### II. Market Sensitivity Case – Alternative Market Conditions

Scenarios	Factors	Assumptions	Comments
<b>Scenario 3 (Hi Rev)</b> <b>* including 3-A, 3-B</b>	Final Maturity	5, 10, 15, 20 years	Analyses run at each final maturity listed at left
	Interest Rates	3.28%, 4.00%, 4.44% and 4.76%	Rates indicated relate to each respective final maturity above; listed rates represent average rate for each est. avg. maturity in alternative market
	Annual Revenues	\$2,657,881,000	Average 12-month cumulative total of federal funds deposited w/in last 24 months, ending Dec. 2002
*	Treatment of Local Pass-Throughs	Scenario 3-A: Included Scenario 3-B: Excluded	Differentiates whether local pass-through revenues are included or excluded in Annual Revenues for purpose of debt service “test”
*	Debt Service “Test”	Scenario 3-A: \$797,364,000 Scenario 3-B: \$590,050,000	Not to exceed 30% of Annual Revenues; Scenario 3-A w/o adjustment, Scenario 3-B adjusted to net-out local pass-throughs

**DETAILED WORKSHEETS  
FOR SENSITIVITY ANALYSES**

# OVERVIEW OF GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY ANALYSES

(\$ in 000's)

	Low Revenue		Average Revenue		High Revenue	
<b>Base Case</b>	<b>I-1A</b>	<b>I-1B</b>	<b>I-2A</b>	<b>I-2B</b>	<b>I-3A</b>	<b>I-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$3,152,681.34	\$2,332,985.97	\$3,533,483.12	\$2,614,776.85	\$3,727,993.68	\$2,758,718.32
Interest rate	2.28%	2.28%	2.28%	2.28%	2.28%	2.28%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Market Sensitivity</b>	<b>II-1A</b>	<b>II-1B</b>	<b>II-2A</b>	<b>II-2B</b>	<b>II-3A</b>	<b>II-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$3,063,621.44	\$2,267,081.59	\$3,433,665.98	\$2,540,912.19	\$3,622,681.82	\$2,680,787.46
Interest rate	3.28%	3.28%	3.28%	3.28%	3.28%	3.28%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Base Case</b>	<b>I-1A</b>	<b>I-1B</b>	<b>I-2A</b>	<b>I-2B</b>	<b>I-3A</b>	<b>I-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$5,751,439.61	\$4,256,068.55	\$6,446,136.67	\$4,770,139.94	\$6,800,982.47	\$5,032,732.49
Interest rate	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	10	10	10	10	10	10
<b>Market Sensitivity</b>	<b>II-1A</b>	<b>II-1B</b>	<b>II-2A</b>	<b>II-2B</b>	<b>II-3A</b>	<b>II-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$5,468,737.97	\$4,046,869.18	\$6,129,288.44	\$4,535,672.31	\$6,466,692.44	\$4,785,357.60
Interest rate	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	10	10	10	10	10	10
<b>Base Case</b>	<b>I-1A</b>	<b>I-1B</b>	<b>I-2A</b>	<b>I-2B</b>	<b>I-3A</b>	<b>I-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$7,796,990.80	\$5,769,777.59	\$8,738,763.10	\$6,466,683.08	\$9,219,813.01	\$6,822,669.03
Interest rate	3.44%	3.44%	3.44%	3.44%	3.44%	3.44%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	15	15	15	15	15	15
<b>Market Sensitivity</b>	<b>II-1A</b>	<b>II-1B</b>	<b>II-2A</b>	<b>II-2B</b>	<b>II-3A</b>	<b>II-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$7,269,442.45	\$5,379,391.51	\$8,147,493.96	\$6,029,144.02	\$8,595,995.79	\$6,361,043.78
Interest rate	4.44%	4.44%	4.44%	4.44%	4.44%	4.44%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	15	15	15	15	15	15
<b>Base Case</b>	<b>I-1A</b>	<b>I-1B</b>	<b>I-2A</b>	<b>I-2B</b>	<b>I-3A</b>	<b>I-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$9,360,752.73	\$6,926,962.29	\$10,491,406.58	\$7,763,638.92	\$11,068,935.70	\$8,191,021.30
Interest rate	3.76%	3.76%	3.76%	3.76%	3.76%	3.76%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	20	20	20	20	20	20
<b>Market Sensitivity</b>	<b>II-1A</b>	<b>II-1B</b>	<b>II-2A</b>	<b>II-2B</b>	<b>II-3A</b>	<b>II-3B</b>
Maximum Par Amount	\$8,575,999.91	\$6,346,244.77	\$9,611,866.10	\$7,112,779.13	\$10,140,978.43	\$7,504,332.18
Interest rate	4.76%	4.76%	4.76%	4.76%	4.76%	4.76%
Annual Debt Service *	(674,313.00)	(498,992.00)	(755,761.00)	(559,263.00)	(797,364.00)	(590,050.00)
Term	20	20	20	20	20	20
* Annual Debt Service constrained to equal Available Annual Revenues. Source: California Department of Transportation.						
(white / non-shaded)	= Base Case Scenarios					
(yellow / shaded)	= Market Sensitivity Case Scenarios					



**DETAILED CHARTS  
FOR SENSITIVITY ANALYSES**

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Base Case, I - 1A (Included)

Low Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,247,710
Debt Service Test (30% of Low Revenue)	\$674,313

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Capacity	\$3,152,681	\$5,751,440	\$7,796,991	\$9,360,753
Annual Debt Service Required	\$674,313	\$674,313	\$674,313	\$674,313

### Base Case, I - 1B (Excluded)

Low Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,247,710
State Portion of Revenues (74%)	\$1,663,305
Debt Service Test (30% State Portion)	\$498,992

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Amount	\$2,332,986	\$4,256,069	\$5,769,778	\$6,926,962
Annual Debt Service Required	\$498,992	\$498,992	\$498,992	\$498,992

(1) The assumed interest rate is based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale. The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Base Case, I - 2A (Included)

Average Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,519,202
Debt Service Test (30% of Average Revenue)	\$755,761

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Amount	\$3,533,483	\$6,446,137	\$8,738,763	\$10,491,407
Annual Debt Service Required	\$755,761	\$755,761	\$755,761	\$755,761

### Base Case, I - 2B (Excluded)

Average Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,519,202
State Portion of Revenues (74%)	\$1,864,209
Debt Service Test (30% of State Portion)	\$559,263

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Amount	\$2,614,777	\$4,770,140	\$6,466,683	\$7,763,639
Annual Debt Service Required	\$559,263	\$559,263	\$559,263	\$559,263

(1) The assumed interest rate is based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale. The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Base Case, I - 3A (Included)

High Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,657,881
Debt Service Test (30% of High Revenue)	\$797,364

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Amount	\$3,727,994	\$6,800,982	\$9,219,813	\$11,068,936
Annual Debt Service Required	\$797,364	\$797,364	\$797,364	\$797,364

### Base Case, I - 3B (Excluded)

High Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,657,881
State Portion of Revenues (74%)	\$1,966,832
Debt Service Test (30% of State Portion)	\$590,050

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	2.28%	3.00%	3.44%	3.76%
Par Amount	\$2,758,718	\$5,032,732	\$6,822,669	\$8,191,021
Annual Debt Service Required	\$590,050	\$590,050	\$590,050	\$590,050

(1) The assumed interest rate is based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale. The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 1A (Included)

Low Revenue (\$ in 000's) **\$2,247,710**  
 Debt Service Test (30% of Low Revenue) **\$674,313**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>5 Years</b>	<b>10 Years</b>	<b>15 Years</b>	<b>20 Years</b>
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	4.60%	5.11%	5.44%	5.67%
Par Amount	<b>\$3,063,621</b>	<b>\$5,468,738</b>	<b>\$7,269,442</b>	<b>\$8,576,000</b>
Annual Debt Service Required	\$674,313	\$674,313	\$674,313	\$674,313

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 1B (Excluded)

Low Revenue (\$ in 000's) **\$2,247,710**  
 State Portion of Revenues (74%) **\$1,663,306**  
 Debt Service Test (30% of State Portion) **\$498,992**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>5 Years</b>	<b>10 Years</b>	<b>15 Years</b>	<b>20 Years</b>
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	3.28%	4.00%	4.44%	4.76%
Par Amount	<b>\$2,267,082</b>	<b>\$4,046,869</b>	<b>\$5,379,392</b>	<b>\$6,346,245</b>
Annual Debt Service Required	\$498,992	\$498,992	\$498,992	\$498,992

(1) The assumed interest rates are based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale (increased by 100 basis points (1%) for market fluctuations). The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 2A (Included)

Average Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,519,202
Debt Service Test (30% of Average Revenue)	\$755,761

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	3.28%	4.00%	4.44%	4.76%
Par Amount	\$3,433,666	\$6,129,288	\$8,147,494	\$9,611,866
Annual Debt Service Required	\$755,761	\$755,761	\$755,761	\$755,761

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 2B (Excluded)

Average Revenue (\$ in 000's)	\$2,519,202
State Portion of Revenues (74%)	\$1,864,210
Debt Service Test (30% of State Portion)	\$559,263

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	3.28%	4.00%	4.44%	4.76%
Par Amount	\$2,540,912	\$4,535,672	\$6,029,144	\$7,112,779
Annual Debt Service Required	\$559,263	\$559,263	\$559,263	\$559,263

(1) The assumed interest rates are based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale ( increased by 100 basis points (1%) for market fluctuations). The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.

## GARVEE BONDING CAPACITY

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 3A (Included)

High Revenue (\$ in 000's) **\$2,657,881**  
 Annual Debt Service Capacity (30% of High Revenue) **\$797,364**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	3.28%	4.00%	4.44%	4.76%
Par Amount	<b>\$3,622,682</b>	<b>\$6,466,692</b>	<b>\$8,595,996</b>	<b>\$10,140,978</b>
Annual Debt Service Required	\$797,364	\$797,364	\$797,364	\$797,364

### Market Sensitivity Case, II - 3B (Excluded)

High Revenue (\$ in 000's) **\$2,657,881**  
 State Portion of Revenues (74%) **\$1,966,832**  
 Debt Service Test (30% of State Portion) **\$590,050**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Assumed Date of Issuance	2004	2004	2004	2004
Assumed Final Maturity	2009	2014	2019	2024
Assumed Interest Rate <sup>(1)</sup>	3.28%	4.00%	4.44%	4.76%
Par Amount	<b>\$2,680,787</b>	<b>\$4,785,358</b>	<b>\$6,361,044</b>	<b>\$7,504,332</b>
Annual Debt Service Required	\$590,050	\$590,050	\$590,050	\$590,050

(1) The assumed interest rates are based on a March 13, 2003, generic A-rated general obligation bond scale ( increased by 100 basis points (1%) for market fluctuations). The rate used is the average for all the maturities in each scenario. It assumes a level debt amortization.